REMARKS

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings do not show propagating the acquisition results forward in time by an amount of time substantially equal to the delay as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner's attention is directed to the block 60 of Figure 2 and the accompanying text in the present application. According to this text, a block 60 determines the changes in the code and frequency offsets as computed by the acquisition block 58, and the block 60 uses the start time noted by the block 54 and the current time to determine the time that has elapsed since the start of signal acquisition. The block 60 uses this elapsed time in order to compute changes in position and rate during the time that signal acquisition is performed by the block 58.

(Although not required by independent claim 1, the block 60 could use data from the inertial measurement unit 30 in propagating the position and rate solution of the GPS receiver 10 forward in time by the elapsed time, i.e., the amount of time equal to the delay. In other words, the navigation processor 32 uses the data from the inertial measurement unit 30 to calculate the start

navigation state (position and rate) at the beginning of signal acquisition and the end navigation state at the end of signal acquisition, and the block 60 uses these start and end navigation states to propagate the position and rate solution for the GPS receiver 10 from the block 58 forward in time for the time that elapsed during signal acquisition.)

The block 62 computes the updated code offset based on the propagated position and rate solution, and the block 64 computes the updated frequency offset based on the propagated position and rate solution. The block 66 hands these updated code and frequency offsets to the tracking function of the GPS receiver.

Thus, as can be seen, the block 60 uses the described time to propagate the acquisition results from the block 58 forward in time by an amount of time substantially equal to the delay, i.e., the time that has elapsed during signal acquisition.

As can be seen, the drawings fully support the propagation limitation of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the drawings fully comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. In this rejection, the Examiner asserts that the written description does not contain a description of the propagation of the acquisition results forward in time by an amount of time substantially equal to the delay as required by independent claim 1.

However, as indicated above in the discussion relating to the objection to the drawings, the text of the present application, in connection with its description of the block 60 of Figure 2, fully describes the propagation of the acquisition results (e.g., code and frequency offsets) forward in time by an amount of time substantially equal to the delay.

As can be seen, the written description of the present application fully describes the propagation limitation of independent claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-12 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is clear that the drawings fully comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) and that claims 1-12 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and issuance of the above captioned patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Schiff Hardin LLP
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 258-5500
Customer No. 000128

By: _____
Trevor B. Jolke
Reg. No: 25,542

December 12, 2005